

the American Fire Service and in paying tribute to these two great Americans.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his excellent statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STRICKLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO DENNIS YARBOROUGH, KIRTLAND, OHIO'S CHIEF OF POLICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, before I had the pleasure of serving as a Member of Congress, I was a prosecuting attorney in Ohio. And while I prosecuted thousands of cases and saw many defendants in court, there was one in 1990 that was notorious; and the facts of the case do not matter; and the defendants, who are all in prison, really do not matter. But what does matter is that that case, because of its notoriety, gave me the things that those of us in public life need to be successful: name recognition, approval ratings. But, more than that, it gave me a friend for life, Chief Dennis Yarborough of the Kirtland Police Department.

Chief Yarborough served in the special forces posted at the White House. He was a highway patrolman in Pennsylvania, and he served as a deputy sheriff before coming home to his beloved Kirtland, where he served as chief of police for 19 years.

Kirtland, Ohio, is a beautiful town. It is a city of faith, it is a city of trees, many churches. It is the home, and those of the Mormon faith will know Joseph Smith stopped in his travels in Kirtland, Ohio, and built the Kirtland Temple. It is a city of good people, and it is a place that Dennis very much loved.

The last case in this series of cases, because of the pretrial publicity, was transferred hundreds of miles from our home; and Dennis and I lived for weeks at a time in 1990 out of our suitcases. And although it prepared me for this life, I have to say that I do not enjoy living out of a suitcase any more today than I did then.

But we did have the chance, when we had dinner at the end of the day or when we had breakfast before going to the courthouse in the morning, to talk; and, just like here, it is good to not talk always about legislation and things political. It was good not to talk about the case all the time.

Dennis' conversation always focused on three things. It focused on the community, Kirtland, where he grew up, a city that he loved, a place that he very much wanted to serve and protect; and it was obvious today at his funeral, Mr.

Speaker, that the City of Kirtland loved him. As we left the driveway of the church, men, women and children lined the street and waved goodbye to their beloved chief. Store merchants put signs on their marquees thanking him for his 19 years of service and saying goodbye.

He talked about his children, Jim and Marcy, and how proud that he was to have been able to participate in the raising of such fine, fine Americans and how he was glad that if he had done nothing else on Earth he was able to provide two young people with a good start in life so that they could be proud Americans as well.

And, lastly, he talked about his wife Gail, his wife Gail whom he had been with since they were 12 years old. As a matter of fact, in our hotel in Toledo the chief had never been away from his wife for an extended period of time, and he could not sleep. So he would get up in the middle of the night, and he would walk the halls of the hotel, and that is how he passed his time.

Today, not only Kirtland, Ohio, but the United States and certainly the area that I represent lost a great man. On Thursday last, while jogging, another one of his passions, he collapsed and died of a heart attack.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, Dennis Yarborough, Chief Dennis Yarborough of the Kirtland Police Department, I believe is in God's arms. And I also pray this evening that the good Lord watches over his family, Gail and James and Marcy; and I know that this country, my district, Kirtland, Ohio, is better for the fact that Dennis Yarborough came their way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MEETING THE NEEDS OF OUR MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week we begin the annual process of marking up our defense bills. These are the largest bills that we enact in this Congress each year and, perhaps, I would argue, the most important.

Unfortunately, we are facing an impossible situation. The only major area of Federal spending where this administration has actually cut has been in the area of national security. All other Federal agencies have either remained stagnant or they have received slight increases. In fact, this is the twelfth consecutive year of defense cuts. Some would say, well, we are still spending more money on the military, but the facts all prove otherwise.

In John Kennedy's era, a time of relative peace after Korea and before Vietnam, we were spending 52 cents of every Federal tax dollar on the military. This year, we are spending 15 cents on the military. In John Kennedy's era, we spent 9 percent of our country's gross national product on defense. This year, it is 2.9 percent.

And back in John Kennedy's era, Mr. Speaker, we had a draft where young people were taken out of high school and they were forced to serve the country and then they served for 2 years and left the service of the Nation. Today, we have an all-volunteer force, well-paid, families, children, education costs, housing costs. So quality of life is a much larger portion of that smaller amount of money that we spend on defense. Our job is to try to meet the needs of our military in a very difficult budget environment.

Now added to this problem of decreasing defense assets is the fact that, over the past 6 years under this President, we have had our troops deployed 25 times around the world at home and abroad. Now that compares to 10 deployments in the previous 40 years. Twenty-five deployments in 6 years versus 10 deployments in the previous 40 years. And the problem, Mr. Speaker, is none of these 25 deployments were budgeted for, none of these 25 deployments were paid for.

So in spite of the dramatically declining defense budgets, we have added up an additional \$15 billion that was not planned for that had to come out of defense programs. So we have had an additional cut of \$15 billion below the authorized budget amount.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is, in the case of Bosnia, we are spending \$9.42 billion on the Bosnian operation. It is not that we do not think we have a role for the U.S. in Bosnia, but what is being said in this body and the other body is, why should America go it alone? Why did we put 36,000 troops in Bosnia when the Germans right next door only put 4,000 troops in that theater? Why are we always asked to foot the bill for these deployments that are so important for regional and global security?

After all, President Bush in Desert Storm got the allied nations to reimburse the U.S. \$53 billion for the costs of Desert Storm which were \$52 billion. Under this administration, we have had no reimbursements; and the \$15 billion of contingency costs have all come out of an already strapped defense budget.

I raise this issue, Mr. Speaker, because we are in for tough times as we approach the 21st century. We cannot continue to meet the needs of our troops under the type of robust commitments that this President has made for the men and women of America's military. We need to understand the sacrifice, and we need to understand that we need to stop the continuing drain of defense dollars that are so necessary to provide the support for these brave men and women.

We also must fund the emerging threats that we see arising. Missile capabilities around the world are coming up. Iran, Iraq are now developing medium-range missiles that North Korea already has.

Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, I would ask our colleagues to join us on the Rayburn Triangle where we will unveil one of the Army's newest programs called THAAD, along with a Scud missile, a 40-foot-long missile that was used by Saddam 7 years ago to kill 28 young Americans in Saudi Arabia. This new Army system that we are desperately trying to fund in this difficult budget environment is designed to meet that threat in the 21st century.

I urge our colleagues to join the Army and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization in seeing firsthand the kind of technology that we are trying to produce in this very difficult budget environment.

A NEW NATIONAL GOAL: ADVANCEMENT OF GLOBAL HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEAL of Massachusetts). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this particular special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, this special order is centered around our effort to double the appropriations, to double the funding, as it were, of the National Institutes of Health over the next 5 years.

I have for a long time appreciated the special efforts made by our scientists, researchers across the country, as have all Members of Congress as we see new, spectacular advances made in research and development of technologies, new ways to cure age-old diseases, those that have scourged the earth for all these years, and new ways of treating people who have reached older age, how to treat infant deaths and the scourge of handicaps that are across the land.

All these research methods and scientific methodologies have blossomed over the last several years to such an extent that we feel confident that to redouble, using those words advisedly, the effort on the part of our entire society will benefit that society in a million different ways.

Pursuant to that, back in November of last year I introduced H.R. 2889. Now this bill would have created and still is extent and could create, if passed, a national commission for the new national goal, that goal being the advancement of global health.

Mr. Speaker, the 20th century saw a goal for the United States thrust upon it.

□ 1845

Our country was designated the role in this entire global conflict that we witnessed during the 20th century of preserving democracy, of repelling total totalitarianism in all of its forms, and advancing the cause of democracy throughout the world. We did that in responding to World War I, and we did magnificently for the sake of preserving Europe; in World War II to preserve the world on every side of the planet, as it were. Since then, in all of the skirmishes and battles and conflicts that have occurred, including Korea and Vietnam and Desert Shield, Desert Storm later, Panama, Grenada, one names it, Bosnia today, the 20th century saw the United States emerge as the saviour of democracy and the proponent, the chief proponent, of democracy. So we met our goal to repel totalitarianism and to preserve democracy.

Now, what should be the goal of the next century, of the 21st century? My legislation calls for the establishment of a commission to determine that the goal for our country should be to eradicate disease from the face of the earth.

Now, this is a great humanitarian goal implicit in the language that I just used, to eradicate disease from the face of the earth, but it also carries with it an enlightened self-interest for our country. Since our country leads the world in pharmaceuticals and research, in development of technologies and biomedical advancements, in biotechnical concepts, in all of the science that is required to hone in on the eradication of disease, not only will we be steadily moving towards the goal of preventing and eradicating disease, but at the same time we will fashion a new leadership, economic worldwide leadership, for our country in producing the wherewithal by which to eradicate those diseases. What that means is more jobs, more enterprise, more prosperity, while helping save humanity from the ravages of the diseases in every corner of the world that too often are unattended.

So what this Special Order here tonight does, it fits splendidly into the goal, the vision that I see for the 21st century. Our message tonight is that now is the time to double, we say to double the appropriations, the funding mechanisms for the National Institutes of Health, which, after all, are the bulwark of all the research and the development that is required to meet these visions that we have of combating disease.

Mr. Speaker, if we relegate funding to the National Institutes of Health of something like 15 percent, to increase the funding for the next 5 years at 15 percent per annum, we would be doubling the number of dollars now being spent for that magnificent institution that provides so much benefit to mankind, the National Institutes of Health.

For instance, right now we spend about \$14 billion. We would go up to \$28 billion, or the doubling about which we speak, by the year 2003. Now, we have been averaging about a 7 percent increase each year. I understand that this year the President offered a 9 percent increase; the Senate version of the proposals would probably be about 11 percent, and we hope that we can do a little better than that and meet the first leg, the first test of trying to double it by getting up to 15 percent. If we do so, then we will see tremendous momentum build up so that we can accelerate the rate and the breadth of the research that is required to meet that vision of eradication of disease among the citizens of the world.

The other feature of what we are doing here is that we did not come up with this idea about the worthwhileness of the National Institutes of Health just simply by saying it. About 5 or 6 years ago we established the Biomedical Research Caucus here in the House of Representatives.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and myself are the current cochairs of that Biomedical Research Caucus. We have had over 60 or so special lectures by the most advanced scientists that we could muster as our lecturers to bring us up to date on the various progresses made by the National Institutes of Health. Among them have been about a dozen Nobel Prize winners in their particular field.

So you name the disease, Mr. Speaker, and I will name a lecturer, renowned lecturer, who has appeared in these very halls of the House of Representatives to give us an update on those diseases. Arthritis, AIDS, women's breast cancer, multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, you name it. I challenge you and I will tell you, not only did we have a luncheon on it, I can even tell you the menu for the luncheon, but also who was the guest speaker and who brought us up-to-date on these developments. In every single case, cloning, new technologies, we even had the people from the space program come to tell us the advancements that were made by reason of space research in these very same scientific methodologies about which we speak.

Now, what is the purpose of all of these things? To bring us up to date to these diseases, but also to give incentives to Members of the House to redouble their efforts to bring about solutions and treatments for the various diseases about which we speak. I must tell my colleagues that in many of these cases, just around the corner lies the final solution to a lot of these archaic diseases that have plagued us for so long.

Now, how do we do this? I have colleagues here who are ready to speak on these subjects. I will yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr.